9/19/72 Dear Jim, I figured you wanted me to read the O'Leary piece so when I got a chance I did. I guess we missed another one. We should have tried to speak to him long ago. There really isn't time to start investigating two years afterward, or to start lining up stuff for the habeas corpus petition two months after its planned completion. But we did miss what the Shaw decision makes even more relevant. Note this appeared in the Reader's Digest dated August 1968. That means ti can't have been anything but handout-based. For O'Leary, on th Star, Hoover's favorite leaking-reading, there was but one possibility. In this case it was not from interhal evidence and, in fact, on t e same basis, could not have been the prosecution in Memphis. All this stuuf, good and bad, came from Hoover/FBI. If we can get him to say that and are refused for the defense what was used for propaganda, I think we score a few possibly valuable debating points. We have a few like this in reserve as it is, but let's add to them. However, the significance here is the poisoning of the minds before the possibility of trial. It has the world's largest circulation, RD, I think. This is the kind of stuff that figures prominently in the Shaw decision. Lets consider alleging it with this and the many others, beginning with Blair, who credits and we can photocopy the credits. HW